2132 IPU

IN THE US PATENT OFFICE

EXAMINER - Lanier

GROUP - 2132

SN - 09/476262

FILED 1/3/00

BY - Kawanaka

AMENDMENT

SIRS:

Responsive to the OA of 9/29/04, applicant respectfully solicits reconsideration and allowance.

The Examiner's Sec. 102 rejection of claims 4-6 over Larose 6,108,420 is believed to be erroneous. Although on its face, Larose appears to be anticipatory of the instant invention, a detailed study of Larose shows that Larose is completely different from the instant invention, and clearly not anticipatory under 102.

There are various points which the Examiner raised which are clearly not correct. What the Examiner has done in the quoted parts of Larose is interpret what he though was happening, since Larose clearly does not state or show or make obvious the points which the Examiner alleges Larose teaches vis-a-vis our recited invention. Rather than discussing each minute point, we will set forth the more important points and how Larose differs.

First of all, it is important to note that we claim "..self destructing said creation after one execution in creating said unique identification information". The Examiner alleges this is shown at col. 3, lines27-40. This is incorrect. Larose not only does not discuss this feature... to the contrary... Larose DOES NOT SELF-DESTRUCT AFTER ONE EXECUTION. This is very important, and is one

1

of the safe-guards of our invention, which no one else has ever done, including Larose.

Second..we provided after use by a user.."said run-time read module is separated from said blank area of said particular software program when the program is terminated..". This is another security safeguard which has not been done before, not even by Larose. The Examiner quoted Col 12, lines 45-53 as teaching this feature by Larose. Careful study show no such thing. HE DOES NOT EFFECT SEPARATION OF THE ID PART FROM THE BLANK PART, as we do.

Thus, clearly, on these two points , which are very important features of our invention, Larose does not show or any way anticipate such features under 102, nor makes obvious under 103.

There are other features which show clearly that Larose is nowhere close to our invention. We claim that the ID module is placed in the blank space INDEPENDENTLY of the other software. The Examiner alleges that Larose shows same at FIGS. 3A-3C. This is factually incorrect. In point of fact, FIGS. 3A-3C shows that the ID modules is NOT INSERTED INDEPENDENTLY AS IN OUR CLAIMED INVENTION. Instead, Larose takes "key" and "file + data" and concurrenlty places same in file 170 using conversion program 110. Carefully studying FIGS. 3A-3C shows that there is NO INDEPENDENT placement of the ID module and other data in the software program. Instead, they are all done by the same "conversion program 110" concurrently and interconnectedly.

Thus, clearly Larose does not anticipate under 102 the

2

instantly claimed invention of claims 4-6; nor does Larose
make obvious same, under 103. The two are completely different.

Note that we use a "self destruct" mechanism, and at the end
we use a "separation" feature, and to keep thing separate we place
the ID module "independently" of ths software. Clearly, these
features are not shown or make obvious by any prior art that we
know of, and surely not Larose.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully solicits
reconsideration and allowance.

In addition, the inventor wishes to add the following tech-
nical comments.

--- The disclosure of Larose (6,108,420) has to have res-
pectiv/e computers in "User Install Agent" (UIA) and "Secure
Distribution Agent"(SDA). Namely, one computer works in UIA and
another computer works in SDA. SDA manages licenses by asking
license information to SDA every time. Thus, the computer in
SIA has to be connected to the computer in SDA.

In contrast, in my invention only one computer is used. My
invention does not use the other computer when license is auth-
enticated. Also, the program itself is disappeared for preventing
further authentication.

On the other hand, if the Larose disclosure uses only one
computer, license information is stored in the User's computer
and it cannot manage licenses.

3

The UIA processes data and makes Application. However, my invention distributes almost completed programs. For example, in the Larose disclosure, after a user uses Application by demo-licenses, he/she buys a formal license and he/she has to make Application again in UIA.

In contrast, my invention makes license with the Program for formal license only. Thus, my invention as recited in the claims, is more simple than the Larose disclosure.----

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims now presented, are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully

M. KOJIMA

MOONRAY KOJIMA

BOX 627

WILLIAMSTOWN, MA 01267

Tel (413)458-2880

1 November 04